

From The Forum, New York, Vol. viii

1889-1890

Goldwin Smith

WOMAN'S PLACE IN THE STATE.

THIRTY years ago or more, in company with John Bright, the writer signed Mill's petition to the British Parliament in favor of the political enfranchisement of women. Both John Bright and he were led to this by their general prepossession in favor of any extension of human rights, combined with their respect for Mill. Both of them afterward changed their minds, and Bright became the most powerful opponent of female suffrage. The writer was led to revise his opinion by finding that those women whom he had always regarded as the best representatives of their sex among his acquaintance, were by no means in favor of the change. A protest from some of the foremost women of England, which has recently appeared, confirms his impression, and at the same time relieves a male writer of the fear that he may be actuated by selfishness of sex in arguing against a female claim.

The agitation went on. Non-political franchises were granted to women. At one time they seemed on the point of grasping the political franchise, but then again the hope receded, and notwithstanding the tendency of the demagogic system, which is always to concession, because the politician fears to make an enemy of the coming vote, the balance seemed to incline against them; when the other day the leader of the Conservative Party, to the astonishment and dismay of not a few among his followers, suddenly declared in favor of female suffrage. It has been said of Lord Salisbury, with not less truth than wit, that he *saute pour mieux reculer*. He is very apt to rush impetuously into positions from which he afterward finds it better to retire. On the occasion when he was hurried into this particular leap he was addressing an assembly of Primrose Dames, that is, female canvassers of the Conservative Party, who are supposed, by bringing their personal influence and fascinations to bear on the lower class of voters, to have rendered great service to the party in the elections; and it may be surmised that his gallantry had

not less to do than his statesmanship with the impulse to which he gave way.

Not that female suffrage is out of the line of Tory policy, as Tory policy is now understood by a portion of the Tory Party. The strategy which Lord Beaconsfield practiced and with which he inoculated a section of his followers, was that which, instead of resisting the democratic extension of the suffrage, seeks to outbid and outflank it, by enfranchising classes over which it is supposed the Crown, the aristocracy, and the church will be able to exercise a special influence. This is Tory democracy, and akin to it is Tory acceptance of female suffrage. Lord Beaconsfield himself was known to be favorable to the measure, though he never made it a plank in his platform, fearing probably that the bulk of his party was not educated up to the mark. It was his belief, and is the belief of many Tories, that the women, under clerical or sentimental influences, would vote on the Tory side, and, especially, that their religious and ritualistic feeling would lead them to uphold the established church. Whether this belief would in the long run prove well founded, may be doubted, since in the bosom of the female politician Conservative sentiment would have a potent rival in revolutionary excitement, and while the Conservative women would be inclined to stay at home, the revolutionary women would always go to the poll. Such, however, is the game. It is the game of the Tory leader in Canada as well as in England. The Canadian Tory leader gives votes to the Indians because the Indian will follow the meal-bag; and he tries to give votes to the women because he thinks that the sex is Tory by nature, though in the last move he has hitherto not been able to carry the body of his followers with him. No great compliment is paid to woman by thus using her for the purposes of party tactics.

Lord Salisbury guarded his avowal by saying that he spoke for himself alone. But a leader of a party and a prime minister cannot speak for himself alone. Mr. Gladstone, or whoever may be leader of the opposition, seeing Lord Salisbury bidding for the women's vote, is sure to bid against him, whatever his own convictions may hitherto have been. The demagogic system is a perpetual Dutch auction, the last bid in which it is difficult to

REVISTA OLIVIA

ADAR 30 36344

foresee. Some are sanguine enough to think that America will have rest when a black woman has been elected president of the United States; but are they sure that when the barriers of sex and color have been broken through, a demagogic crusade will not commence against the limit of age? I have heard an English Radical say that "a vote is the right of every sentient being."

At present the franchise is sought in Great Britain only for unmarried women and widows. But evidently the movement will not stop there. It cannot logically or justly stop there. If the special interests of women and the home are to be represented, it is preposterous to exclude all those women who are actively discharging the proper functions of their sex, and all women who have a home. Nor is it intended that the movement should stop at spinster and widow franchise. Spinster and widow franchise is merely the thin end of the wedge, if indeed, considering that the claim of spinsters is less than that of married women, it may not rather be called the thick end. The abolition of subordination in the family, of the authority, usurped or obsolete as Radicals deem it, of its head, and of everything that tends to merge the civil personality of the wife in that of the husband, is the prime object at least of the extreme wing of the party, which would be achieved if man and wife could be seen fighting against each other at elections.

Since England has got loose from her old political moorings, and under the name and forms of a monarchy turned herself into the most unbridled of democracies, America has become the more conservative country of the two, and we seem farther from a great revolution in the relations between the sexes on this side of the water than they are on the other. Something may be due to the fact that, suffrage here being universal, and there being no proposal to limit the franchise to unmarried women, the change presents itself at once in its full magnitude. But more is due to the conservative instincts of the "territorial democracy," and to the superior robustness of republicans who have had a long tenure of political power. The American citizen, satisfied of his right, is not infected with that feeble facility of abdication which takes possession of the soul of tottering privilege and makes it yield at once to every clamorous demand. A great safeguard is

furnished by the necessity of submitting all constitutional amendments to the popular vote. The people are not trembling for their re-election; they are not afraid of making an enemy in advance of any possible "vote" of the future; nor can they be personally interviewed, wheedled, and bullied as the members of a legislature are.

In the last session of Congress, however, a committee of the Senate, of which Mr. Blair was chairman, reported favorably the resolution for a constitutional amendment enacting that "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." The resolution assumes the existence of a right, thereby begging the whole question, as the committee seem partly aware. If there is a right, the denial or abridgment of it is, as a matter of course, a wrong.

According to one theory, the right has already been recognized by the fourteenth constitutional amendment; but, as the committee say, "the great misfortune of those who thus believe is that the Supreme Court holds just the contrary opinion." For holding the contrary opinion, the Supreme Court has had vials of wrath poured upon it; but surely it had common sense upon its side. Nobody could imagine that the nation, in passing the fourteenth amendment, meant to introduce woman suffrage; and a court must be the slave of verbal technicalities indeed, if it can hold that, by the mere use of an unguarded phrase, a community has entrapped itself into a transfer of half the sovereign power, and a revolution in the relations between the sexes at the same time. English courts, upon an analogous appeal, decided in the same way, though in England the appellants were able, not only to show that the words of the law, as construed by them, were in their favor, but to cite the historical precedent of queens who in the Saxon times had sat in the Witenagemote.

The other ground on which the claim is made, and which, as the committee say, is not inconsistent with the legal ground, is that of natural right:

"The suffrage is a natural right inherent in all who are capable of exercising the political functions of citizenship; that is to say, who are capable of becoming component parts of the aggregate body of sovereigns in all governments which are republican in form."

To this the reply is that what is essential to the republican form of government, can be gathered only by induction from a survey of such republics as have existed; and that of all the republics which have existed, not one has given a share of the sovereign power or a part in government to women. It might have been thought that theories of natural right to the possession of political power had been buried in the grave of the political philosophers of the last century. That to which, and to which alone, every member of a community, whether man, woman, or child, whether white or black, whether above or below the age of twenty-one, has a right, is good government, and such things as are necessary or conducive to it. We are thus thrown back on the practical question whether female suffrage is necessary or conducive to good government. Say the committee:

"Jefferson trembled when he remembered that God is just. Now woman, our equal, asks relief from her greater wrongs. We shall refuse them at our peril. God is still just. Jefferson's forebodings were but a glimpse of the terrible retribution which descended upon the people."

All this and much more to the same effect, and equally full-bodied in style, proceeds on the assumption that every one has the same right to a share in the government which he or she has to immunity from the worst kind of injustice; than which nothing can be less self-evident to the ordinary mind.

"In muscle," say the committee, "woman is inferior to man; but muscle has nothing to do with legislation or government. In intellect she is man's equal; in character she is by his own admission his superior, and constitutes the 'angelic' portion of humanity." Here, as throughout the report, and indeed in the whole discussion, the amatory somewhat intrudes upon the legislative. The question, however, is not whether the intellectual gifts of woman are equal in value to those of man, or whether her character compared with his is angelic, but whether her understanding and character are as well fitted as his for the special functions of politics and government. Neither the intellect of Newton nor the character of John Wesley would be disparaged by saying that they were not well fitted to command a fleet or to perform a surgical operation. If government requires a masculine understanding or temperament, and if the practical character

by which political questions are likely to be best settled resides in the man, whose sphere is the world, rather than in the woman, whose sphere is home, that is a reason for preferring such government and legislation, quite independent of any invidious comparisons, whether intellectual or moral. Perfect equality may reign between two beings whose spheres are different, and who are the complements, not the competitors, of each other.

Muscle, the committee pass over as having nothing to do with the matter. But the fact is that muscle has a great deal to do with the matter. Why has the male sex alone made the laws? Because law, with whatever majesty we may invest it, is will, which, to give it effect, must be backed by force; and the force of the community is male. As Gail Hamilton quaintly but forcibly expressed it, "every ballot is a bullet." Muscle is the coarse foundation on which the most intellectual and august fabric of legislation rests. Divorce the law from the force of the community, and the law will become ineffectual. If the case of queens regnant is cited, the answer is that a queen regnant has the public force at her back. Suppose the women, when invested with political power, were to make the laws which they threaten to make in their own interest and against that of the man, would the men execute the law against themselves? We have seen extravagant proposals for increasing the severity of the penal code in all cases of offenses against women. Suppose any such proposal were carried by the female vote, would the men obediently inflict the penalties on each other? That the tendency of a state governed by women would be to arbitrary and sentimental legislation, can hardly be doubted. Prohibitionism in its most extreme form would almost certainly carry the day. Possibly legislation against tobacco might follow. Would men obey, knowing that the law had no force behind it? If they did not, what but disregard of law and consequent confusion would ensue?

One of the ladies whose evidence was taken by the committee, admits that in the days of force, when women needed the protection of man, male government may have been justifiable; but these, she says, are days of piping peace. Days of piping peace, when there are millions of men in arms, when armaments are being increased daily, and the hammer of military prepara-

tion is clanging in all the forges of war! It would be impossible to allow questions of peace and war to be decided by the women's vote. The women of France some years ago would probably have voted a war for the support of the temporal power of the Pope. The women of England might have voted intervention in favor of the Queen of Naples, by whose heroism their hearts were greatly moved. In both cases the men would have refused to march or act, and government would have succumbed.

Power to elect implies power of being elected. Exclusion from the legislature and from political office, would be a grievance not less exasperating than the present exclusion from the polls. In England the leaders of the movement evidently look forward to full participation in public life. In fact, it may be suspected that here lies the chief motive power of the agitation. Yet the feelings of the sexes toward each other must have greatly changed before women can, like men, be held strictly responsible for the performance of official duty and punished for the breach of it. Even to criticise them as men are criticised, would be offensive to sentiment. We saw it stated that lady principals of the city schools in New York, the other day, protested against the reappointment of education commissioners of their own sex, on the ground of the noxious immunity from criticism which, through the gallantry of the men, female commissioners enjoyed.

The belief that women will impart their tenderness and purity to politics is surely somewhat simple. They are tender and pure because their sphere has hitherto been the home, which is the abode of tenderness and purity. Thrown into the arena of political strife, the "angels," if experience may be trusted, instead of imparting the angelic character to the male combatants, would be in danger of losing it themselves. In the desperate party conflict which has been raging in England, each party has put its women in requisition as canvassers on a large scale; and we are misinformed if the result has been the infusion of a more angelic character into the fray. "Corruption of the male suffrage," say the committee, "is already a well-nigh fatal disease." But what assurance have they that women, when exposed to the temptation, will not take bribes? What assurance have they that in regard to appointments to office women will be especially free from per-

sonal influence, or more rigorous upholders than men of the principles of the civil service act? If we mistake not, the most trenchant attack upon the principles of that act, and the most open defense of public favoritism that we have read, was from the pen of a woman.

"Enfranchise women," says the report, "or this republic will steadily advance to the same destruction, the same ignoble and tragic catastrophe, which has engulfed the male republics of history." This seems to imply a new reading of history, according to which republics have owed their fall to their masculine character. The Greek republics were overwhelmed by the Macedonian monarchy, their surrender to which was assuredly not due to excess of masculine force. The Roman republic was converted by the vast extension of Roman conquest into a military empire. The city republicanism of the middle ages was crushed by the great monarchies. The short-lived commonwealth of England owed its overthrow to causes which certainly had nothing to do with sex. The Swiss republic, the American republics, the French republic still live, so do several constitutional monarchies, including Great Britain and her colonies, which are republics in all but name. It is true that these commonwealths, though, we may hope, less directly threatened with the wrath of heaven than the report assumes them to be, are yet not free from peril; but their peril apparently lies in the passions, the giddiness, the anarchical tendencies of the multitude, and would hardly be averted by opening another flood-gate and letting in all at once the full tide of feminine emotion.

Of female government we have no experience except in the cases of queens regnant and female viceroys. Without going through a tedious list, we may safely say that there is not among these any example of such transcendent beneficence that the hope of reproducing it can warrant us in risking a great revolution. Queen Victoria is cited as a paragon of female government. The truth, as every one ought to know, is that she reigns but does not govern. As wearer of the crown she has social duties of an important kind, which since the death of her consort have never been performed, and the persistent neglect of which, in spite of faithful advice and warnings, have in the case of Ireland

led to the most calamitous results. The Queen's life and merits have been domestic. In her "Journal" there are two references to public events, one to the Franco-German and the other to the Egyptian war. In the first the writer had a son-in-law, in the second she had a son. Should the time ever come, as, with revolutionary forces of all kinds at work, is conceivable, when it may be necessary for the salvation of the country to adopt a policy involving some risk to the Crown, the sex of the sovereign may prove a serious misfortune, since it is impossible to give counsels involving any risk to a woman.

It does not follow, as the committee seem to assume, because women do not vote or take a direct part in politics, that their influence on government and legislation will be lost. It is already powerful, and nowhere more powerful than in the United States. There runs through all these arguments and denunciations the fallacious assumption that women are a class apart, excluded from the privileges which are enjoyed by the other classes. But women are not a class; they are a sex, identified in interest, bound up in affection, and living in the closest communion with the voting and governing sex, the character of which as mothers they have molded, and which is constantly permeated by their ideas and sentiments. The ballot is not the only suffrage or the only scepter. There are men who, from the special nature of their occupations or from indifference to party struggles, have hardly cast a vote in their lives, and who yet have exercised a marked influence on public opinion. Such men would probably find it difficult to understand the transcendent value attached to participation in active politics or to the possession of a vote. We have been told that unless women vote they cannot take any interest in public affairs, and even that they cannot read history. Facts show that they can do both.

If women were really a class without votes, their class interest might suffer. But we repeat, and it is the very gist of the matter, that they are not a class but a sex. What special interest of women can be named which is in danger of suffering at the hands of a legislature composed of their husbands, sons, and brothers? What grievance is there, redress of which has been denied? It is reasonable to ask this question before we invoke

a revolution. The only specific grievance within the power of legislation to remedy, mentioned by any of the ladies who give evidence, is that a woman is tried, it may be for infanticide, by a male jury. But have the innocent been convicted, or does any one wish the guilty to escape? It surely cannot be doubted that male juries are lenient to women. It is not the woman who has difficulty in getting justice against the man, but the man who has difficulty in getting justice against the woman. Liberty of divorce, if the lack of it was once a subject of complaint, has now been conceded in measure so abundant that the statistics have become almost appalling, and women themselves are beginning to recoil. The separation of the wife's property from that of the husband is as complete, nay as jealous, as it can be, short of an absolute dissolution of the domestic partnership. Almost every sort of suffrage except the political has been conceded, or is in process of concession. Women are being admitted to the professions, even to that of law, albeit justice, which would seem to be the main object, is not likely to be promoted by the addresses of female counsel to male juries, unless sex can be altogether eliminated, as some people appear to think that it may. Male universities are thrown open to women; and if the proportion of women who resort to them is small, this is due to the instinct of parents who prefer for their daughters female places of education. Woman has made her way to the smoking room and has mounted the bicycle. She began to adopt male attire, and nothing but her own taste stopped her. After all, Nature has made two sexes. Nobody thinks it a compliment to a man to be called effeminate; why should we think that to become masculine is the highest ideal of woman?

The complaint has been made, and is echoed in the evidence appended to the report, that women, compared with men, are underpaid in professions and trades. Economic relations are sometimes a good deal governed by custom, and it would be rash to affirm that upon women as new-comers in certain employments, custom has not borne hard. But in employments where their position is established, such as those of the singer, the musician, the novel-writer, the artist, or the milliner, women are not underpaid. Who is more overpaid, or, if managers speak the truth,

more rapacious, than a prima donna? One element of value in labor must be the complete devotion of the laborer to the employment; and a woman, unless she has finally renounced marriage, cannot be completely devoted to an employment, nor is she likely to rival male perfection in it. In truth, female labor which takes the woman away from her home and from her natural duties, which are those of the wife and mother, is a sad, and we may hope a transient, necessity of our present stage of civilization. But, at all events, every economist and every person of common sense knows that questions of wages must be settled by the market, and not by the legislature. If there were a female legislature, and it made laws requiring men to give for woman's work more than the men thought it worth, men would resist or evade compliance; and again law and government would fail. But this suggestion, and others which are akin to it, open to us a vista of the agitation which would be set on foot when the majority of the holders of political power were women, and politicians had begun to play for the woman's vote.

The report proclaims that "without the exercise of the inalienable natural right of suffrage, neither life, liberty, nor property can be secured." To the ordinary observer it appears not only that the lives, liberties, and properties of American women are secure, but that they are more secure, if anything, than those of the men; and that the attitude of men in the United States toward women is rather that of subjection than that of domination. In fact, if the epithet "slave," so lavishly used by every one who thinks that he has not the exact amount of power which he ought to have, is to be seriously applied to any one not in actual bondage, it will hardly be to a woman, who is being maintained, perhaps, in the height of luxury, by her husband's labor, and for whose comfort and convenience special arrangements are made wherever she goes. "Actual and practical slavery," which one of the ladies who give evidence declares to be the condition of woman without the ballot, has certainly in the case of the American slave disguised itself in very deceptive forms. "No one," says another lady, "has denied to women the right of burial, and in that one sad necessity of human life they stand on an equal footing with men." Such language seems to mock

our understandings. Comparisons of the condition of woman denied the suffrage with that of the Negro in the South, have often been made, and in this report we are told that the exclusion of women from a convention

"constituted the startling revelation of a real subjection of woman to man world-wide and in many respects as complete and galling, when analyzed and duly considered by its victims, as that of the Negro to his master."

The Negro, nevertheless, would not have been sorry to change conditions. Just as these lines are being written, the papers give an account of a raid made upon a place where liquor was sold by a party of women in masks, who beat the proprietor with clubs. Several such acts of violence on the part of women have been recorded; and they are committed apparently not only with impunity but with general approbation. Resistance to them appears to be proscribed. These are not practices in which the Negro was allowed to indulge toward his master before emancipation, or in which he has even been allowed to indulge since. If the men of the United States were called to account for their treatment of the women, and the women at the same time for the performance of their special duty to the race, it seems doubtful, at least supposing that American writers on these subjects tell the truth, whether before an impartial tribunal judgment would go against the men.

This extreme language about the "slavery" of women who are not in possession of political power, has its origin largely in John Stuart Mill's treatise on "The Subjection of Women," which has become the manual of the movement and has set its tone. Without disparagement to Mill's general powers or to his admirable character, it may be said that on this particular subject of the relations between the sexes he was influenced in his writing by the disturbing circumstances of his own life, as was Milton on the same subject, though in a directly opposite direction. His disciples assure us that he had always been in favor of enfranchisement; but of the exceeding bitterness of his language, and of what any one who judges by the visible relations of man and wife to each other will deem his extreme overstatement of the case against the husband, an explanation must apparently

be sought in the fact which his "Autobiography" discloses. The immense expectations of improvement in government from the participation of women which he had formed, may in like manner be traced in part to the passionate affection which had caused him to see a genius equal to that of the greatest man, in a woman whose intellectual gifts, to cooler observers, appeared not to be extraordinarily high.

Surely this hideous story of the injustice and cruelty of man to woman could never be repeated by any one who was versed in the philosophy or imbued with the charities of history. Woman as a rule, has not been the slave or the toy of man, but his wife, his mother, and his sister. The relation between the sexes has been that of partnership in a very rough and imperfect world, where each sex has had its share of joys and sorrows, of special burdens, and of special immunities. Man has had to do, and has still to do, most of the rough and dangerous work; nor does any preacher of woman's rights propose to take it off his hands. Men fought, in the fighting days, for their wives and children as well as for themselves. Woman has indeed had her full share of pain and woe, but she has also had her privileges and exemptions. The relations between man and wife, and those between the sexes generally, have varied with the course of civilization. Freedom, which may be the blessing of a woman now, would have been her curse in the days of force, and would be her curse still in countries, like Arabia and Afghanistan, where force continues to reign. If the Indian woman has had to carry the kit, the man has had for days together, perhaps fasting, to be tracking the deer. The grave in a backwoods burying place, where a pioneer and his wife rest together, after their life's struggle with the wilderness, is not a bad monument of the general history of the sexes. The union of those two people may not have been unchecked, but nobody can doubt that on the whole they have been helps and comforts to each other. Man has too often been unkind to woman; man has not always been kind to man; woman has not always been kind to woman; nor has woman always been kind to man. The unkindness of man to woman has been of the coarser and more palpable; that of woman to man has been of the subtler but not less cruel kind. Of the ad-

vances made by woman, though uninvested with political power, in position and influence, there can be no doubt. Civilization has begun to be measured by the degree of her ascendancy, and this without reference to the manner in which she discharges her special duty to the community.

That the sex has its privileges in America, no woman, it is presumed, will deny. Do the woman's rights party expect to combine the prerogatives of both sexes, and to have equality and privilege too? For a time perhaps they might, while the ancient sentiment lingered; but the total change of relations would in the end bring a corresponding change of feeling. Chivalry depends on the acknowledged need of protection, and what is accorded to a gentle helpmate would not be accorded to a rival. Man would neither be inclined nor bound to treat with tenderness and forbearance the being who was fighting and jostling him in all his walks of life, wrangling with him in the law courts, wrestling with him on the stump, manœuvering against him in elections, haggling against him in Wall Street, and perhaps encountering him on the race course and in the betting ring. But when woman has lost her privilege, what will she be but a weaker man?

The framers of this report say nothing, and the advocates of the political enfranchisement of women generally say very little, about the probable effect of the change upon marriage and domestic relations. In truth, the enthusiasts of sexual revolution are usually little careful, sometimes they are even rather contemptuous, in their treatment of this part of the case. Mill, whose union with his wife was an ardent and philosophic friendship rather than an ordinary marriage, says comparatively little about children, and the writer has noticed the same omission in the speeches and writings of some other advocates of the cause. Yet surely this is not a point to be overlooked. If it were reasonable to draw a comparison between two things which are different in their uses and each of which is indispensable in its way, we might be inclined to agree with the Comtists, who prefer the family to the state. At all events, it may be said that the family might rebuild the state, while the state could never rebuild the family. Is the double life produced by the complete union of a married

pair higher and better than the single life? Is wedded affection the greatest source of our virtue and of our happiness on earth? Are the permanence of marriage and the order of the household essential to the formation of character in the children? Then we ought at all events to see our way when we are dealing with these things. Hitherto the family has been a unit before the state; this has been a fundamental law of our social organization, and to repeal it is a grave step and one certainly fraught with serious consequences for good or evil. In the abstract, perhaps it may be said that a spiritual or moral union ought to survive any estrangement of material or political interest; but to assume that it will survive, is unsafe. The foundation of man is in the dust. The union of the heart is rather severely tried when legislators decree that upon a woman's dying intestate the whole of her property shall go, not to her husband, who may be left in beggary, but to a distant cousin; thus abrogating the Christian principle that the woman shall leave her father's house to cleave to her husband, and proclaiming that her remotest cousin is nearer to her than the man on whose breast she has laid her head. But would it survive the introduction into the family of political strife? Would the citizen and citizeness, in such times, for example, as that of the anti-slavery agitation or the Civil War, after struggling against each other in the canvass and at the polls, sit down in unimpaired affection by the hearth and present the same aspect of love and united authority to their children? Beautiful pictures no doubt are drawn of such harmonious conflicts; but are they not mere pictures; are they true at most with regard to any but exceptional characters and quiet times? We shall of course have female planks in every platform, women at all the conventions, and the demagogue in the family. A man when he marries takes on him the heavy burden of maintaining a wife and family; he expects as his reward a loving partner and a happy home. Make marriage too onerous and unattractive to man, whether in regard to property or in regard to the civil status of the pair, and what will follow? License which the legislator will be powerless to repress, unless he can eradicate or subdue the mightiest of all human passions, as some seem to think that they can. In a reign of license, what would be, what has been, the condition of woman?

The report ends by saying that men can have no motive for refusing the suffrage to women but the selfish one of unwillingness to part with half of the sovereign power. Selfishness in this matter would undoubtedly be not only wickedness but folly. What is good for woman, is good in the same measure for man, and ought not for a moment to be withheld. One lady in her evidence warns Congress, if it will not give way, that the wild enthusiasm of woman can be used for evil as well as good, and threatens in America a repetition of the scenes of the French Commune. More terrible even than this menace is the fear of doing an injury to man's partner, and thereby a deeper injury to man himself. But the change ought to be proved good. Before man hands over the government to woman, he ought to be satisfied that he cannot do what is right himself. In an age of "flabby" sentiment and servile worship of change, we have had enough of weak and precipitate abdications. To one of them we owe the catastrophe of the French Revolution and the deluge of calamity which has followed. To man, as he alone could enforce the law, the sovereign power came naturally and righteously. Let him see whether he cannot make a just use of it, in the interest of his wife and children as well as in his own, before he sends in his resignation.

GOLDWIN SMITH.

ve for
illing-
ess in
folly.
r man,
n her
e wild
d, and
rench
ear of
ury to
Before
satis-
ge of
e had
them
eluge
d en-
ously.
he in-
re he

TH.